

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 25-46 were pending. Claims 25-46 were rejected. In this response, no claims have been cancelled or added. Claim 46 has been amended without introducing any new matter. Thus, claims 25-46 are pending. Reconsideration of this application, in light of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 25-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,618,100 B2 of Miller (hereinafter "Miller"). The Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that Miller does not disclose each and every element of the invention claimed by the Applicants.

Miller describes a method and apparatus for presenting a current document along with thumbnail images of documents, relevant to the current document, in a graphical user interface (Miller, Abstract; Column 3, line 63 to Column 4, line 35). A user may select a thumbnail to display the document represented by the thumbnail as a new current document (Miller, Column 4, lines 35-44). The content of each thumbnail, or related document, is predetermined according an "automatic content analysis procedure" (Miller, Column 5, lines 21-38). After a current document is displayed, categorized documents as determined by the automatic analysis procedure are displayed as thumbnails (Miller, Column 7, lines 30-50; Figure 4, elements 410-430). Only after the current document and categorized documents/thumbnails are displayed within the graphical user interface, does Miller describe waiting for and processing user inputs (Miller, Column 7, line 46 to Column 8, line 8).

With respect to claim 25, the Applicant claims:

A method, used in a computer system that includes a user input device coupled to a processor, a display and a memory, for viewing at least one of a plurality of documents, including a document selected as a current document displayed in a first display area of the display, the method comprising:

(a) in response to a first signal from the user input device corresponding to movement of a pointer in the first display area, displaying in a second display area of the display a representation of content of another document associated by a link to the current document, without selecting the other document as the current document and displaying the other document in the first display area of the display;

(b) in response to a second signal from the user input device distinguishing from the first signal, selecting the other document as the current document;

(c) displaying the other document as the current document in the first display area of the display; and

(d) repeatedly performing steps (a), (b), and (c), re-using the first and second display areas of the display, to present different documents in the plurality of documents to a user.

That is, a current document is displayed in a first area and another document is displayed in a second display area in response to a signal which corresponds to movement of a pointer in the first display area. Applicant respectfully submits that Miller fails to describe or suggest this feature. Rather, Miller describes automatically displaying thumbnails of documents as determined by an “automatic content analysis procedure,” and not in response to a signal corresponding to pointer movement. Thus, the applicants respectfully submit that Miller fails to describe each and every feature as claimed by the Applicant.

The examiner argued that Miller specifically discloses the feature noted above in “displaying corresponding to a movement of a pointer in the first display area” at Column 6, line 56 – Column 7, line 29. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Rather, the passage from Miller cited by the Examiner describes the user entering “preferences for personally

configuring the GUI” (Miller, column 6, lines 56-58). That is, the user can influence, in advance, the appearance of the GUI used to display the thumbnail images generated by the automatic content analysis procedure. However, the thumbnails are automatically generated and displayed, along with the current document, according to the “predetermined, user-defined criterion” (Miller, Abstract; Column 6, line 54 to Column 7, line 29; Figure 4). Since thumbnails are automatically generated and displayed, Miller fails to describe another document displayed in a second display area in response to a signal which corresponds to movement of a pointer in the first display area.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome by the remarks. Since independent claims 32, 39, and 46 contain similar features and limitations to those discussed above, claims 32, 39, and 46 are also not anticipated by Miller under 35 U.S.C. § 102 for similar reasons. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Further, dependent claims 26-31, 33-38, and 40-45 depend from claims 25, 32, and 39, and include additional features and limitations. Since claims 25, 32, and 39 were not anticipated by Miller under 35 U.S.C. § 102, Miller also fails to anticipate claims 26-31, 33-38, and 40-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 25-46 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION


Applicant respectfully submits the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 3/1/02

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael J. Mallie  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 36,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300